

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1-15 stand rejected. In this response, claims 1, 5 and 9-12 have been amended and claims 16 and 17 have been added. No new matter has been added. In view of foregoing amendments and following remarks, the Applicants request allowance of the Application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements. Office Action, Page 2. Claim 10 has been amended to recite connection and relationship between the components of the claim. Claim 11 is a dependent claim of claim 10 and has been amended to incorporate one more feature. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Page 2 of the Office Action states a data structure per se is non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claim 9 overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caufield et al. (US Pat. Pub. 2007/0177571) (hereinafter "Caufield"), in view of Chasman et al. (US Pat. Pub. 2007/0180075) (hereinafter "Chasman"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Caufield And Chasman Do Not Disclose An Application Descriptor

Claim 1 recites, in relevant part:

storing at least one application descriptor, ***wherein the application descriptor describes the association between each of the at least one computing device participating in the application and each of the respective resources, ...***

As described in detail below, the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least these features.

The Office Action asserts that Caufield describes that association between the user ID of the device and component or resources that the user is allowed to synchronize with the server. Office Action, page 3. However, Caufield only discloses associating mobile device **users** with roles that include rules. Caufield, Abstract, Fig. 2. As Caufield states: "the network server 102 stores in the component stores 114 a **user profile 200 for each user. Each user profile 200 includes information specific to the user**, such as a password. Additionally, each user profile 200 can include roles 202 that define which component types the user will have access to during a synchronization." Caufield, paragraph [0024]. This is in clear contrast to claim 1, which recites association between computing devices and resources. To further distinguish from Caufield, claim 1 has been amended restate the a computing entity as a computing device. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Caufield does not teach the claimed element of association between computing devices and resources.

Moreover, the Office Action admits that Chasman does not explicitly disclose storing an application descriptor, which describes the association between computing device and respective resources. Office Action, page 5. Thus, Chasman fails to cure the deficiency of Caufield. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art either alone or in combination does not teach the application descriptor.

Further, claim 1 has been amended. In relevant part, claim 1 recites:

and the application descriptor maintains a complete representation of all distributed applications in the network; and
providing access to the application descriptor in order to facilitate administration of the distributed software application ***and to automatically configure the at least one computing device.***

The cited references Caufield and Chasman, either alone or in combination, fail to teach the amended features.

Each of independent claims 5, 9, 10 and 12 recites at least a similar feature of an application descriptor as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit independent claims 5, 9, 10 and 12 are allowable at least for the same reason as stated above. The dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, 11 and 13-15 are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All outstanding rejections have been overcome. It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is in clear condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Although not believed necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

The Office is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-220-4200 to discuss any matter regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 25, 2008

/Robert L. Hails/

Robert L. Hails

Registration No. 39,702

Kenyon & Kenyon LLP
1500 K Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005-1257
Tel.: (202) 220-4200
Fax.: (202) 220-4201